1 (Case called)

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Good afternoon, your Honor, David

Abramowicz for the government. I am joined at counsel's table

by senior investigative auditor Jeffrey Freeman of the New York

City Department of Investigation.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. M. FARKAS: Good afternoon, Michael Farkas, and I am joined at counsel table by the senior partner, my father, George Farkas, as well as Ms. Levin.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. You may be seated.

Let me tell you what information I have. I have the presentence report prepared on July 31 of this year and revised on August 31, and that contains the addendum and conclusion by the probation department that the appropriate offense level is 19, the criminal history category is I. The guideline range is 30 to 37 months. The recommended sentence by the probation department is 12 months on the basis of a variance.

I have the defendant's sentencing submission of the Messrs. Farkas, which is 33 pages, and it requests and it says: Either of the proposed incarceratory sentences. According to the sentencing proposals set forth on page 32 of 33, the defense is seeking a sentence of probation with continued community service, spiritual counseling, marriage and family therapy and psychotherapy. And it states alternatively: Should the Court deem a more restrictive component to be

necessary, the defense requests a period of home detention under the same conditions and any others deemed appropriate by the Court and the probation department.

Attached to the defendant's submission are scores and scores of letters and a submission by the Aleph Institute and a -- I am trying to find the doctor's name -- it's a psychological evaluation -- all of the attachments of the sentencing submission, and I have read them.

And, in addition, I have the submission of the government, dated September 13, which is ECF document 81; the PSR is ECF document 79. And in the government's submission, dated September 13, which, as I say, is ECF document 81, the government submitted that a sentence of probation that includes a period of home confinement would be sufficient but not greater than necessary to serve the legitimate purposes of sentencing.

I was actually quite surprised that that was the recommendation of the government.

Mr. Farkas, is there any additional written information I should have?

MR. M. FARKAS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Government, is there any written additional information I should have?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Farkas, have you and your client read

1 | and discussed all of this information?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. M. FARKAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do either you or your client have any objections to the findings of fact in the presentence report?

MR. M. FARKAS: No objections. Just the notes that I have made in my submission. I think in my submission I pointed out some relatively minor factual differences, such as ages.

THE COURT: Let me ask this. Let's go through it. I don't know how many there are, but it seems to me what you are saying is, essentially you don't have any objections to the findings of fact. If you do, let's hear them.

MR. M. FARKAS: I don't.

THE COURT: Government, do you have any objections -Mr. Farkas, this went both to you and to your client. You
understood that?

MR. M. FARKAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Government, any objections to the findings of fact?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I adopt the findings of fact.

Mr. Farkas, in your presentation, if there is anything you want to bring to my attention in that regard, let me know, but I gather you view your objections as not material to the sentencing decision.

Is that what you were telling me?

(212) 805-0300

1 MR. M. FARKAS: I agree, your Honor. Thank you. 2 THE COURT: Again, for the record, I adopt the 3 findings of fact in the presentence report. 4 Mr. Farkas, why don't you tell me what it is that you 5 want me to know. Again, I have read every single one of these letters and all of the information in your submission. But you 6 7 can tell me whatever it is you want. 8 MR. M. FARKAS: With regard to the PSR, your Honor, or with regard to sentencing in general? 9 10 THE COURT: With regard to sentencing, anything you 11 want me to know, including what's in the PSR, if you want to 12 respond to that. 13 MR. M. FARKAS: I guess, just on a technical level, 14 with regard to the PSR, I will note that in the government's 15 submission, they do consent to having the applicable guideline 16 range reduced to a level 17 with an applicable range of 24 to 17 30. 18 THE COURT: Let me respond to that because that's 19 worthwhile. 20 MR. M. FARKAS: Yes, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: The 4C1.1 change hasn't taken effect. It 22 takes effect on November 1. I am perfectly prepared to 23 sentence this defendant as if it was 17 and I, with a guideline

report has found, which is 19 and I and a guideline range of 30

range of 24 to 30 months, as opposed to what the presentence

24

25

1 | to 37.

But because this is prior to November 1, my intention at this point, subject to what you are going to tell me, is that the offense level will be 19, the criminal history category will be I, the guideline range will be 30 to 37, but my sentence is going to be the same, regardless of whether it was 19 and I or 17 and I.

Are we on the same wavelength?

MR. M. FARKAS: 100 percent, your Honor.

THE COURT: Government, you're with me?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Proceed.

MR. M. FARKAS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Just to guide you, I was surprised at the government. It was a more lenient recommendation than I thought the government would recommend. Given that the parties are pretty close to each other, if not absolutely congruent, I don't think that I am going to deviate in any material respect from that, so that should give you serious — hear what I have to say. Go ahead.

MR. M. FARKAS: Your Honor, certain senior counsel who might be sitting at the table taught me, as a young attorney to quit while he's ahead.

THE COURT: I think that's appropriate.

MR. M. FARKAS: If your Honor --

THE COURT: I don't want to mislead you. It's not going to be exactly what the parties are asking for.

MR. M. FARKAS: That's quite all right. I have nothing to say that has not been articulated in my very extensive submission. As you can see, I took great care to put everything I had into the submission. I'll dare say that it is more lengthy and extensive than most of my submissions have ever been, and that's not to devalue any of my other client's cases.

Just, this was a very compelling and moving case for me personally, as well as professionally, worthy of meeting Ms. Levin and seeing how she approached this case from the day she walked into my office, seeing how Aleph embraced her, seeing what she has done ever since. It has been extraordinary in every sense of the word.

I don't have anything to add that your Honor hasn't already very faithfully considered in my submission. I was going to highlight some points, but again, I'm quitting while I'm ahead.

Rabbi Brysky from Aleph is here today to discuss not only his impressions of Ms. Levin and her efforts since they began working with her, but also the details of his alternate sentencing proposal, which again have been laid out in my submission, but he obviously has a more personal perspective to share about that.

I can appreciate that your Honor is considering a sentence that while it may be similar to what the government and I are proposing, that you may have other concerns and ideas, so to speak. We are available to answer questions that you might have with regard to that.

But I think what we are seeking is pretty clear, and we have tried to present you with a comprehensive proposal to ensure all of the purposes and tenets of sentencing.

THE COURT: If you want Mr. Brysky to speak, I certainly will listen to him, but I certainly am not going to outsource supervision to a private organization.

MR. M. FARKAS: Right. I am glad you mentioned that, your Honor, because one of the things I wanted to mention was that I didn't mean to suggest that.

THE COURT: That's exactly what you are requesting, because you want the two proposed institutions to be what the Aleph Institute has suggested, and indeed you say, under supervision. I don't know if you used that word. But that's exactly what you are asking me to do.

MR. M. FARKAS: From my perspective, your Honor, call this perhaps a bit more of a state court perspective, when someone is on probation as being supervised by the probation department, they are going to choose certain providers for therapy, for community service, for what have you.

Our proposal is that at least to include these

extensive proposals in probation's overview and supervision so that the community service that she would be performing, which she is actually currently performing and is committed to continue performing, for example, through Aleph would continue under the supervision of not only Aleph but the probation department, in addition to whatever conditions that your Honor and probation may feel are additionally necessary.

THE COURT: I do note that her volunteer work with those two organizations commenced at or about the time of the plea, is that correct?

MR. M. FARKAS: Those are the most recent, your Honor, yes. She has continued -- there are so many efforts, it's hard to list them.

THE COURT: She has had a life of a great deal of service to her community, no question about that. The references to the two service positions that she has held under the aegis of Aleph were at or shortly after the time of her plea.

MR. M. FARKAS: That is correct, your Honor. After getting to know her and forming a proposal and a paradigm that would be, in everyone's opinion at Aleph, most appropriate for her, this is what was constructed and that is where that came from.

THE COURT: If you want somebody else to speak to me, go ahead.

MR. M. FARKAS: I'd like to introduce Rabbi Yossi Brysky, who is the chair of the alternate sentencing for Aleph.

MR. BRYSKY: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir. Welcome.

MR. BRYSKY: Thank you.

I may look like some of Sheina's relatives here in court, but I help many others who don't look like me or practice the same faith as me.

THE COURT: That may be true, sir. I have no reason to doubt it. But I can tell you that in my years of experience, to my recollection, Aleph has never made a recommendation for any defendant, except those who are Orthodox Jews.

MR. BRYSKY: Your Honor, that is probably very close -- that is probably how it works here in New York. I zigzag the country advocating for individuals all over the country that are -- as long as they are ready to sign up for our program. It happens to be that a lot of the people here in New York do know about me.

I lived in Crown Heights, Brooklyn for 23 years. I never met Ms. Levin before in my life. When I found out, when she told me that she had pled guilty, that's when we step in, as long as they are pleading guilty with sincere remorse and they are ready to enter our program. We have had defendants who would say they would rather go to prison for a couple of

months than follow through with our intense program.

THE COURT: Even when they do go to prison, I normally have a request from the defense, I think it's to be put in the prison in the area of the Bureau of Prisons that encompasses Florida, because I think you have some programming down there, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. BRYSKY: That's correct. We have a headquarters in California and Brooklyn as well.

When people call, we are not the go-to organization for anyone who is enmeshed in the criminal justice system. If someone calls me and, says here is my story but I'm absolutely innocent, I recommend they get a very good lawyer. If they tell me they pled guilty because as a matter of convenience they don't to want to go to trial, costs too much, I will tell them to get a very smooth-talking lawyer for sentencing.

If someone calls, like Sheina did, and her voice is cracking when she is talking about the victims and she is reading her psych report that we asked her to do, she is reading the mitigation narrative that we asked her to help draft, then she is looking at herself in the mirror and she is recognizing that this is something that she needs to work on. She needs to step it up. She studies classes with me on a weekly basis. We study teachings based on Maimonides and going beyond the letter of the law.

All I'm asking from this Court is that, of course, as

1 counsel mentioned, probation is meant to supervise all of her 2 activities as the Court decides, but ultimately we do work with 3 probation on the specifics of -- if probation would like to 4 work with us, we try to meet with the chief whenever we can in 5 various districts. Ultimately we are working with them to make 6 sure those hours are meaningful hours, which she already is 7 doing, and we are simply asking the Court that the Court not 8 interrupt this process that is rehabilitative and benefiting 9 society.

Your Honor, thank you very much for allowing me to address the Court.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your coming here to tell me what you do.

Mr. Farkas, is there anything else you wish to say?
MR. M. FARKAS: No, your Honor. Subject to your

THE COURT: Thank you.

questions, that is my presentation.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me hear from the government.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Thank you, your Honor.

We too will largely rest on our submission, although I do want to respond to -- your Honor is surprised at our sentencing recommendation. I'd like to emphasize that it's not a recommendation we came to lightly. It certainly was a very close call, given the nature of the offense here. This is a serious offense. It obviously harms the organization involved,

BPHN. It harmed essential services for people in need.

THE COURT: It harmed everybody because inevitably, as a result of this crime, what people do is, they lose confidence in the ability of the government, specifically the City of New York, to administer programs that help the poor and underprivileged. So she has undercut her own mission.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: That's exactly right, your Honor.

THE COURT: This crime has ripple effects.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: It certainly does and it does undermine public trust, and we see --

THE COURT: In fact -- go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: And we see that it's not an isolated problem. It's a problem that has plagued New York City for years and it's a problem that, as your Honor knows --

THE COURT: It's not limited to Mr. Rivera here.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Exactly. It's not limited to
Mr. Rivera and Ms. Levin. It's a problem that others have
fallen into as well. We understand that, and we take that very
seriously.

The offense is serious. There is a need for general deterrence, given the number of especially private contractors and businesses involved in providing these services and the amount of money there is to be had. And there certainly needs to be an understanding out there that back-room deals involving corruption won't be tolerated, and we think we have shown our

view on that with this prosecution and others, including before your Honor.

To explain our recommendation a little bit, we did feel that the mitigating factors here were extremely strong and unusual, beyond the scope of what we usually see.

I just want to emphasize the ones I'm focused on.

This was an early plea, in our view. It was before indictment.

It was before any discovery was produced or requested. It did

follow what we consider a sincere effort to cooperate by Ms.

Levin, although we did not extend a cooperation agreement to

Ms. Levin, and we are not making 5K1.1 requests for a

departure.

THE COURT: My sentence is not going to be based on a departure. It's going to be based on a variance.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Exactly, your Honor.

We are not making that request because we ultimately did not require the substantial substance, but I will acknowledge that her efforts to cooperate were sincere, and we credited what she told us.

Finally, there is a financial component here.

THE COURT: As I understand it, the agreed upon restitution will be paid rather quickly from the escrowed funds, which are more than the agreed-upon restitution.

Am I correct in that?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, I believe they are more, and it

1 | is our position that they will be and should be paid promptly.

THE COURT: I am going to direct that they be paid promptly.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: It's significant, in our view, that it is Ms. Levin who is paying it, even though she is jointly and severally liable with the person we considered to be more culpable of the coconspirators, which is Victor Rivera.

THE COURT: I agree. In the scheme of this indictment, he is more culpable, that's correct.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Those are the factors driving our recommendation here.

I do want to note that I share your Honor's -- what I detected are concerns with the prospect of any sort of outsourcing of the supervision or of any probation. So it's certainly our view that the Court should not deviate from its typical practices and its typical reliance on the probation office.

THE COURT: Mr. Brysky has put my concerns to rest there.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Good.

With that, I think that's all I have, your Honor, unless you have any questions.

THE COURT: Thank you. No.

Ms. Levin, you have the right to speak to me. You don't have to say anything at all. And I do need to tell you

It began back in February of 2021, when I was first

came before you publicly acknowledging my wrongdoing.

contacted by Mr. Abramowicz and faced a reckoning unlike

23

24

25

anything I had ever experienced in my life.

I started on the day to beg God, the government, and anyone I may have hurt so deeply for forgiveness and a second chance. To try to earn that kind of deference, I have attempted to show who I truly am, and pour every ounce of effort into doing just that.

For two and a half years leading up to this day I have one immense self-reflection. I have spent this time in prayer and meditation, trying not only to understand how I came to this point, but on owning my actions and taking responsibility for them. It has been a time of deep introspection, listening and learning. I ask myself constantly, what does God envision for me? How do I grow through this devastating experience? How do I reconnect with the voice inside of me that knows the difference between right and wrong?

making the world -- this world a better place, and I put my whole heart into doing that. Giving of myself, being involved in my community, and helping anyone in need comes as second nature to me. My parents taught me first and then my children continue to teach me to love the person standing in front of me, to be a listening ear, to care, to put people's welfare first, to open my home and my heart to those in need.

When I reflect on my crime and how I got here, I become physically ill. I don't recognize myself. I have

shattered myself and everyone around me. My body trembles at the thought of possibly not being able to care for my elderly parents, my husband, my children, my grandchildren, and all those who depend on me.

My time reflecting on all of this horror, however, has brought out something deep inside of me that will be with me forever. I am the better person for it.

I know that my attorneys have presented a lot of information to you demonstrating who I truly am. My passion is contributing to society in any way I can. I live to help others. I have messed up really badly, and I will spend the rest of my life atoning for this. I take full responsibility for my criminal behavior — for the criminal behavior I have committed. Not a day will go by where I won't use this dark time and immense pain that I have caused to deter others from straying as I did. I plead from the bottom of my heart to allow me to stay on the straight and narrow path of caring for my family, my parents and continuing my life in the most humble and ethical of ways.

With immense gratitude for your compassion, again, I thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Let me ask this, Ms. Levin. Some people don't have an answer. I don't want you to make up an answer. But if you engaged in reflection, why did you do this?

1 You can talk to your attorney.

What led you to do this?

THE DEFENDANT: There were a lot of things that led up to the relationship. It started out as a normal business relationship. And I saw Mr. Rivera as somebody who was 30 years in recovery, in sobriety, really working with people, and, by nature, a very trusting person. And it went from regular business to a situation where — from a for profit to the not for profit. I don't even think I realized how it was changing until it did.

THE COURT: The kickbacks were described as consulting fees, so you knew full well that when you are getting money back to him, it wasn't on the up and up. And I know you were very successful in the real estate business, so I assume you were a sophisticated business woman.

THE DEFENDANT: I was paying him from my pocket.

THE COURT: No, no. You were paying him from the Bronx Parents Housing group's pocket.

I want you to address me.

THE DEFENDANT: I didn't understand that's what I was doing. My -- the difference between the lease and the sublease was the profit that I was -- was the money that I was making and, I didn't understand that it might have been money that could have gone or should have gone to BPHN because the numbers that I negotiated --

THE COURT: Then why did you put it down as consulting fees?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't know. There was no logical --

THE COURT: I want you to talk to me.

THE DEFENDANT: I understood by that point that I wasn't allowed to pay him. And this was his -- I don't even know how to answer it.

THE COURT: I take it you see that as a major mistake.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. As a major -- I have told my children many, many times and anybody I see, sometimes you think that -- you are not sure if what you are doing is right or wrong. The second you feel that it's wrong, you need to stop. You need to listen to that part of you that says no. Don't let someone convince you that it's fine.

And I will regret it for the rest of my life. And the possible pain that I can cause my parents is killing me, and I would never — this is truly against my nature and my personality, and I got caught up in something that I didn't quite understand at the time and then I understood.

I am very, very sorry and remorseful for anything that I did, anything that I have done. I have spent my life and my career helping people.

THE COURT: I think that's true, and I think you are very remorseful, and all of these letters are a testament to your efforts throughout the years to help your community and

1 others, no question about that.

THE DEFENDANT: What I do for a living is, I help the community that doesn't have a voice. This is what I do. I'm in real estate, and I could have easily gone to the gentrification of real estate, and I didn't. My heart didn't let me. I became known in the industry as, oh, yeah, she does programs. That was who I am. I'm the one you go to if you want your apartments rented to programs, if you want to work with nonprofit organizations. That's what I do. And I love doing it. I love helping.

I met a guy on the street the other day, a young boy from our community who was definitely -- I don't know if tomorrow he will be alive. I said, whoa, I can't just leave him in the street. I bought him lunch, and I sent him to the shelter. I spoke to SUS, who is Services for the Underserved and I said, I'm sending him in an Uber to you. Please let me know when he gets there, and we need to arrange for services for him, or he won't survive.

This is what I do. I wasn't doing anything that was unusual for me. So when I see organizations doing that, I was very excited and very happy to be a part of it. That's who I really am. That's who I want to be. I'm very grateful that God let's me do that to make a living.

THE COURT: I don't mean to break you at all, but the fact of the matter is, in the course of your doing that, you

committed a serious crime by depriving the Bronx Parent Housing Network of \$800,000 that otherwise would have gone to them, or if you don't view it that way, as simply you were illegally kicking back to Rivera \$800,000.

THE DEFENDANT: That's what I thought. That's what I realized I was doing. It wasn't money that would have gone back to Bronx Parent Housing Network. It wasn't money that they would have gotten.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. M. FARKAS: Your Honor, would you mind if I elaborated on that last point?

THE COURT: Go ahead. It is money they would have gotten if it were an arm's length negotiation that Rivera had not put his thumb on and not found a willing cooperator in connection with the conspiracy and Ms. Levin.

MR. M. FARKAS: 100 percent, your Honor. This is the one small area.

THE COURT: You say 100 percent. Make sure Ms. Levin understands that because she seems to think that it was coming out of her pocket.

MR. M. FARKAS: That is how she perceived it at the time, your Honor. That is what Ms. Levin perceived at the time. I don't think it's unusual for someone in her position years ago to have proceeded that way mistakenly. It does not detract from the knowing wrongfulness of the act. If your

Honor --

THE COURT: Again, I certainly don't mean to berate her, and she has done an enormous amount of good in her life, and I have every reason to believe will continue to do so, serving her community and others on a constant basis — I have read all the letters — opening her home throughout the world, constantly assisting them in a variety of ways, welcoming and supporting scores and scores, probably hundreds of people, having an open home for meals and for people to sleep in. I was wondering how she could do that with "only" five bedrooms, but one of the letters says they slept on the floor. That made more sense when I read that.

But there is no question about her remorse and there is no question about her early cooperation with the government. The government has already spoken to that. But I'm not sure she really understands the ripple effects of the loss of confidence in the antipoverty programs that her participation is subject to.

MR. M. FARKAS: There is no doubt, your Honor. It's funny because this is the exact point that Mr. Abramowicz and I started speaking about the moment we met and brought us all through the government's recommendations. This has probably been the subject of more discussion than any other point, at the time she committed the wrongdoing, knowingly paying Mr. Rivera, when it was wrong and illegal to do so. There is

no doubt that she -- that's why she pleaded guilty, because she was paying kickbacks that she knew she was not allowed to pay.

THE COURT: And, quote, hiding them all, although it's not very well hidden as consulting fees.

MR. M. FARKAS: Because she knows that they couldn't be direct payments to him for anything else because it's not legal.

The question of appreciating how this was taking money out of —— even theoretically or practically out of BPHN's coffers and therefore the city's coffers is not a point that she appreciated at the beginning of this process or certainly when she committed the act, because her lay, logical thinking was, the city is paying a fair, in fact a very competitively fair market value rate.

THE COURT: I am surprised the contract apparently wasn't changed.

MR. M. FARKAS: That is a major point that I made in the submission.

THE COURT: I think that probably goes to negligent oversight by the city, but I understand how you are using it.

MR. M. FARKAS: I did anticipate you saying that. The civil attorney who negotiated that, at very, very difficult effort with the city, he is actually sitting in the courtroom today to back me up in case I say something that doesn't make any sense. But this was so heavily discussed and fought over

intellectually with the city, it's not negligent oversight, your Honor.

The bottom line is that the city obtained, like it had hundreds and hundreds of times before and since, a proper rate to house this homeless population in these buildings.

If Ms. Levin had decided to act legally and say no to Victor Rivera when he said where is my cut, then the exact same conditions and terms would be continuing to this day, and BPHN would never receive any part of Ms. Levin's end, so to speak, from the contract. It was her illegal act of paying him THE kickbacks that now even created this theoretical deprivation to BPHN of these hundreds of thousands of dollars. Because had this contract proceeded legally, had Victor Rivera never said, give me my end, and Ms. Levin said yes, no other money would be going to BPHN.

So in her mind at the time, paying him out of her end, I think is understandable that she wouldn't appreciate how that has now deprived BPHN and the city of something. Of course we know, as attorneys and jurists, that that is correct. She has come to appreciate that now.

But in answering your Honor's question about whether she appreciated it at the time, I thought she was very honest. She didn't. She didn't get it. It has taken a lot of soul searching and a lot of legal explanations to explain what that impact is, as well as the broader, perhaps the most important

impact, and that is on the integrity and the public's trust of the system, be it not for profit or for profit.

My discussions with Mr. Abramowicz focused on and began and ended with this point. He will tell you, in our first meetings he was like, what are you talking about? It's obviously their money.

THE COURT: Their being BPHN.

MR. M. FARKAS: BPHN, right.

The contract should have been reduced by half, or whatever the percentage is.

And although he isn't saying something differently completely now, I think we all agree that the contract had — has never been and will never be half. It was simply Mr. Rivera acting illegally that deprived that organization of, even theoretically, more money, and now, of course, Ms. Levin understands that.

And I don't think enough can be said about how she handled the dispute with the city and BPHN that really demonstrates who she is, your Honor. I made this point too, but I don't know if it really came through. Ms. Levin --

THE COURT: It did. The monies are in escrow. I understand that.

MR. M. FARKAS: It goes well beyond that. What she did was great. She is a criminal defendant. She is facing a criminal case. It's a good thing to get money in escrow to pay

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the restitution. It will look good for her at sentencing.

That's the common, let's just call it strip-down reality.

But in this case it's not. Because had she handled that dispute with BPHN without any legal basis whatsoever, unilaterally decided to stop paying the rent two years ago and then first they did and then the city said, you, no illegal basis whatsoever, stopped paying the rent, but still expected the hundreds of people we are housing in these buildings to be cared for as if the contract is in full effect, when that happened, Ms. Levin had a lot more options than what she availed herself of. She could have started and ended the entire dispute adding millions and millions of dollars of arrears and late fees and penalties to what that settlement had be to. She could have terminated the lease immediately and forced the city's hand. She didn't do any of those things because she knew that by doing any of that, it would increase the amount of money that the city would have to pay to service this homeless population, and she did not want that, and that's why she took over a million dollars out of her pocket to pay the landlord while BPHN and New York City sat on the payments for no legal reason whatsoever.

Mr. Buss, who is in the audience today, was begging me, let me start an Article 78. Let me bring up some kind of mandamus action against the city. They can't do this. But that's not what Ms. Levin wanted. She kept the contract going.

She kept the lease in effect out of her own pocket.

And, finally, the settlement was reached weeks ago, where not only was only the base amount of rent arrears paid, no penalties or interest of any kind, but the contract is now continuing for the rest of its life, the amount of years, and by now it's a far-below-market contract rate for these services.

I think it's important that your Honor understand that nobody would have begrudged her if she had gone for more money, but she didn't want to do that, and we could have had more money for forfeiture today from this settlement if we wanted, but we didn't think it was right.

Subject to your questions, your Honor, I think that kind of beats the horse dead.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Levin, if you will rise.

Before I formally impose sentence, Mr. Farkas, did you wish to lodge any objections to sentencing?

MR. M. FARKAS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Abramowicz.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I hereby find that the total offense level is 19. The criminal history category is I. The guideline range is 30 to 37 months.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is

the judgment of this Court that the defendant, Sheina Levin, is hereby sentenced to time served. In addition to time served, she shall be placed on supervised release for a period of two years with the conditions recommended by the probation department, namely, the mandatory conditions set forth on page 32 of the presentence report plus the standard conditions 1 through 12 set forth on pages 32 and 33 of the presentence report.

In regard to the mandatory conditions, I am suspending the mandatory drug testing requirement. She shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, but I am suspending the requirement to submit to one drug test within 15 days of release and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter.

Within 72 hours of the entry of the judgment in this case, Ms. Levin shall report in person to the probation office in the Southern District of New York.

In addition to the standard and mandatory conditions,

I am imposing the special conditions that are set forth on

pages 33 of the presentence report.

Special condition 1 is providing the probation officer with access to all requested financial information.

(212) 805-0300

Special condition number 2 is participation in an outpatient mental health treatment program approved by the probation office which shall include psychotherapy.

Special condition number 3 is that she shall not incur

new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of her probation officer.

I am adding special condition number 4. Special condition number 4 is that she shall serve nine months on home detention where she is restricted to her residence at all times except for employment, education, religious services, medical, substance abuse, or other mental health treatment, attorney visits, court appearances, court-ordered obligations, or any other activity preapproved by her probation officer. The home detention condition for nine months shall include -- I'm sorry. The way to phrase that is, the first year of supervised release shall include 20 hours of work per week for the first year in programs to be approved by her probation officer.

The recommendation of the Court is to accept the recommendations of the Aleph Institute for 10 hours per week of volunteer work with the Urban Outreach Center in its location on First Avenue in Manhattan, and 10 hours per week of work for Housing Plus in its efforts to place women in permanent housing in the Trinity Church location or out of the Trinity Church location. That is 20 hours a week of community service for the first year of supervision.

Defense, is it clear? Let me make sure everybody understands. Two years of supervised release of which nine months is on home detention and the first year of which is 20 hours of volunteer work per week for nine months with the

recommendation of the Court for placement, as I say, at the
Urban Outreach Center and Housing Plus. But that's subject to
approval by the probation department.

MR. M. FARKAS: Just so I understand, your Honor, any other activities reviewed and approved by the probation department on home detention --

THE COURT: Absolutely. Including, as I say, employment, so she can go about her job.

MR. M. FARKAS: We will review care responsibilities with the probation department.

THE COURT: Yes, exactly.

MR. M. FARKAS: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: I am not imposing a fine because I find

Ms. Levin lacks the ability to pay a fine after taking into

account the presentence report and her family responsibilities.

I am imposing restitution, and I am signing the order of

restitution here. Let me read it.

I take it has been consented to, is that correct, sir?

MR. M. FARKAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: It provides for restitution in the total amount of \$838,808.78 to the victim, which is the Bronx Parent Housing Network, Inc. It's joint and several with victim Rivera in 21 CR 221. The payment instructions are in the order that I'm signing. I have signed that order.

I am going to direct that restitution be paid within

- 1 15 days of the entry of the judgment because I understand that 2 there is already an escrow, \$814,013, that's owed to Ms. 3 Levin's company and is in escrow, plus she is holding in escrow 4 an additional \$265,000. By my calculation, that's more than 5 the \$838,880.78 that is the restitution order. So I'm 6 directing that restitution be fully paid by this defendant 7 within 15 days of the entry of the judgment. 8 Has a preliminary order of forfeiture been entered, Mr. Farkas? 9 10 MR. M. FARKAS: Yes, it has. 11 THE COURT: Government, Mr. Abramowicz. 12 MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor. It's in the sum of \$790,835.06? 13 THE COURT: 14 MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: I am imposing that forfeiture order, and 16 upon entry of the judgment my understanding is that the 17 preliminary order becomes a final order. 18 I hereby order Ms. Levin to pay to the United States a 19 special assessment of \$100, which is due immediately. 20 sentence would be the same even if the guidelines were offense 21 level of 78, criminal history category I, and a guideline range 22 of 24 to 30.
  - This is a substantial variance, Ms. Levin. I am sure Mr. Farkas and perhaps Mr. Abramowicz will explain that to you. I think the substantial variance is appropriate, in light of

24

25

your lifelong charitable efforts, the fact that this is your first felony, first crime, your sincere attempts to cooperate, your early acceptance of responsibility, and I do think it's quite appropriate.

Mr. Farkas, do you know of any legal reason why this sentence should not be imposed as I have stated it?

MR. M. FARKASP: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Abramowicz.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: If I could just clarify one thing, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Because we have seen some complaints in other cases about community service requirements, it seems to me that the community service requirement here is completely appropriate, in part because it was actually requested by the defense as an alternative to other components of sentencing, and therefore there cannot be any error that can be complained of later by the defense. If we could just put that on the record.

THE COURT: What do you want me to put on the record?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: I suppose just ask the defense

whether there is any objection to the community service

component.

THE COURT: Let me make it lucid.

Home detention is for nine months. Supervised release

1 is for two years. For the first year she is to perform 20 2 hours a week of community service. I have recommended two 3 programs that in turn were recommended by the defense. 4 are not to be supervised by Aleph. It's to be supervised by 5 the probation department. Aleph is to have no role in it. 6 It's between the court, probation office for the Southern 7 District of New York, and the defendant. Is that clear, sir? 8 MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor, I think it's clear. 9 I just wanted to clarify that the defense has no objection just 10 to the quantity. 11 THE COURT: Does the defense have any objection to 12 that ruling? 13 MR. M. FARKAS: It does not, your Honor. Perhaps I 14 should just ask for clarification. I don't want Aleph to have 15 any supervisory responsibility, but I believe that they will 16 probably be able to inform the probation department with the 17 nature of the programs if probation wants that information. 18 THE COURT: The probation department can ask anybody 19 about anything it wants. 20 MR. M. FARKAS: Very well. 21 MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Nothing else from the government. 22 THE COURT: I hereby order the sentence to be imposed 23 as I have stated it.

in the plea, and is it 37 and below?

Government, is there a limited waiver of appeal rights

24

25

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Levin, you have the right to appeal the sentence I have just imposed on you. If you cannot pay the cost of an appeal, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. I do wish to inform you that in your plea agreement you agreed to waive the right to appeal the sentence, and you agreed to waive the right to collaterally attack the sentence if I sentenced you to 37 months or fewer months. In fact I have sentenced you to time served, so it's very much below 37 months.

If you make a request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf immediately.

Do you understand your appeal rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Farkas, if Ms. Levin wishes to appeal, all she has to do is tell you that. In any event, I instruct you to file a notice on her behalf.

Do you understand, sir?

MR. M. FARKAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any open counts or underlying instruments?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Levin, I don't think I need to tell you anything. You've had an admirable life of service. I expect that will continue. I think you do understand the nature of the crime. I don't want to belittle it. It's

substantial and it does impact people's faith in governmental services.

You clearly have the support of your community. For

You clearly have the support of your community. For the record, there are a substantial number of people in this courtroom. And, again, all of those letters, scores and scores of letters were quite laudatory. You will be OK. I have no doubt I won't see you here again.

Good luck to you. Thank you.

(Adjourned)